

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

Kimberly White,

Plaintiff,

v.

Medicredit, Inc.; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Civil Action No.: 2:15-cv-2223-PMD

**COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
JURY TRIAL**

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Kimberly White, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants’ repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. (“FDCPA”) in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Kimberly White (“Plaintiff”), is an adult individual residing in Andrews, South Carolina, and is a “consumer” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant Mediacredit, Inc. (“Mediacredit”), is a Missouri business entity with an address of 3620 Interstate 70 Dr Southeast, Columbia, Missouri 65201-6582, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by Mediacredit and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. Mediacredit at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. A financial obligation (the “Debt”) was allegedly incurred to an original creditor (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meet the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Mediacredit for collection, or Mediacredit was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. Within the last year, Mediacredit contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt from “Liseta Roland” (the “Debtor”).

13. In or around February 2014, Plaintiff explained to Mediacredit that she was not the Debtor and that they were calling the wrong telephone number.

14. Plaintiff then requested that all calls to her cease.

15. Despite knowing that it was dialing the wrong number, Mediacredit continued to call Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt at an annoying and harassing rate.

16. Mediacredit has placed roughly 60 calls to Plaintiff after having been informed that the Debtor was unreachable at Plaintiff's number.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

17. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

18. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT –
15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

19. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

20. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(3) in that Defendants contacted Plaintiff in regards to the third party's debt on numerous occasions, without being asked to do so.

21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.

24. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

25. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II

WRONGFUL INTRUSION INTO PRIVATE AFFAIRS

26. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

27. South Carolina state law recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy in such a manner as to outrage or cause serious mental suffering, shame, and humiliation to Plaintiff; thus, the Defendants violated South Carolina state law.

28. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with phone calls to her home.

29. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to the Plaintiffs were so persistent and repeated with such frequency that they caused serious mental suffering, shame, and humiliation to Plaintiff thus satisfying the state law requirement for an invasion of privacy.

30. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities demonstrated blatant and shocking disregard of Plaintiff's rights and resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

31. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.

32. All acts of the Defendants and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, the Defendants are subject to imposition of punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3);
4. Punitive damages; and
5. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: June 2, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Nathan A. Earle, Esq.
P.O. Box 1714
Travelers Rest, SC 29690
nearle@lemborglaw.com
nathanearle@upstatelegal.net
Telephone: (864) 915-5228

Of Counsel To
Sergei Lemberg
LEMBERG LAW L.L.C.
A Connecticut Law Firm
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (888) 953-6237